

LACKENBACH SIEGEL LLP

**Lackenbach Siegel Building
One Chase Road
Scarsdale, New York, U.S.A. 10583**

**Phone: (914) 723-4300
Fax: (914) 723-4301
E-Mail: mail@lslp.com**

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: March 8, 2004

TO: Ljiljana V. Ceric, Examiner **FACSIMILE NO.:** 703-746-4955
Patent & Trademark Office

FROM: J. Harold Nissen **NO. OF PAGES:** 9

RE: Response to Paper Dated February 9, 2004

Appl. No.:	10/089,121
Applicant:	Malcolm Barry JAMES
Filed:	May 1, 2002
TC/A.U.:	1722
Examiner:	Jeevon Jones
Docket No.:	COLLI.P 33
Customer No.:	28752

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 09 2004

GROUP 3700

Certificate of Deposit by Fax:
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by facsimile to 703-746-4955 on the following date:

J. Harold Nissen

J. Harold Nissen
Signature

March 8, 2004
Date


CONFIDENTIAL: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, or have encountered any problem in receiving it, please notify us immediately by telephone. Thank you.

Appl. No.: 10/089,121
Inventor: Malcolm Barry JAMES
Filed: May 1, 2002
TC/A.U.: 1722
Examiner: Jeevon jones
Docket No.: COLLI.P 33
Customer No.: 28752

Certificate of Deposit by Fax:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by facsimile to 703-746-4955 on the following date:

J. Harold Nissen


Signature

March 8, 2004
Date

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 09 2004

GROUP 3700

RESPONSE TO PAPER DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2004

In response to the paper dated February 9, 2004, Applicant's Attorney submits the Argument contained in the Response which was held to be non-responsive and which provided the undersigned attorney with thirty days to Respond.

Applicant's attorney submits the previous arguments and has removed the proposed amendment for claim 30 only sets forth in the Remarks for purposes of interview and discussion with the Examiner. Accordingly, for this purpose, the last five lines of page 4 was omitted and all of previous page 5 with the exception of the last two lines were omitted. In all other respects the argument remains the same.

Applicant's attorney has used this procedure because access to the original submission could not be obtained, and Applicant's attorney only wanted to remove the portion for interview purposes.

Accordingly, a copy of the check for the extension is also submitted and the present paper, as well as the previous paper has been signed again with the omitted portion.

Applicant's attorney kindly thanks the Examiner for her assistance in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:


J. Harold Nissen
Reg. No. 17283
Customer No. 28752
Telephone No. 914-723-4300
Fax No.: 914-723-4301

Enclosure

Modified Previous Non-Responsive Amendment
Copy of Check No. 105665

LACKENBACH SIEGEL LLP

105665

DATE	DESCRIPTION	CHECK
		105665

DIR. OF THE U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFI
10/29/03 COLLISON P-33 10/089,121 ONE
MO EXT

INVOICE #	AMOUNT	CHECK
	55.00	105665

DEDUCTION	NET AMOUNT
	55.00

CHECK DATE	CONTROL NUMBER	TOTALS ▶	Gross:	Ded:	Net:
10/29/03	105665		55.00	0.00	55.00

